

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/074,624	02/13/2002	Yoshikazu Nakayama	57A 3216	7347
75	90 06/16/2004		EXAM	INER
KODA & ANDROLIA			JAGAN, MIRELLYS	
2029 Century Park East Suite 1430			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3024			2859	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/074,624	NAKAYAMA ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mirellys Jagan	2859
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second o		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · —	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	nt(s)(PTO-1449)	
10. Other:	gen.	Y
_	Dings Outle	F
•	Diego Gutie Supervisory Paten	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's proposed amendment adds the limitation that the nanotubes are made of carbon, i.e., are carbon nanotubes, to the claims. Therefore, these new limitations presented in the proposed amendment raise new issues since a carbon nanotube was not claimed in the finally rejected claims.